



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,786	09/09/2003	David A. Matthews	MS#304020.01 (5438)	1822
38779	7590	03/04/2010		
SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT)			EXAMINER	
100 NORTH BROADWAY			KI, PENG	
17TH FLOOR				
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/04/2010	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/658,786	Applicant(s) MATTHEWS ET AL.
	Examiner SIMON KE	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-16 and 19-46 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-16 and 19-46 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 7/2/09.

Claims 1, 3-16, and 19-46 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 20, 27, 33, and 41 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 7/2/09, claims 1, 8, 20, 27, 33, 39 and 41 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, 12, 14-16, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693) in view of Leong US Patent US Patent 5,513,342.

As to claim 1, Hansen (FIGS. 12-15) discloses a system for sizing a tile arranged with one or more other tile in sidebar on a computer display (cursor 56 and tile 11 FIG. 14, col. 1 lines 58-60, col. 5 line 17-19), the system comprising:

an automatic sizing routine for automatically sizing the tile during an automatic mode (i.e. automatic sizing routine for tiles consists of resizing sidebar, col. 8 lines 42-44, col. 8 lines 49-50 and col. 8 lines 60-62, col. 1 line 60-col.2 line 14, see also calendar example: col. 6 lines 35-39 shown in FIGS. 25 and 27),

a manual sizing routine which allows a user to manually set the size of the tile during manual mode (col. 5 line 17-19, col. 5 lines 21-23), and

wherein the title is operated in the automatic mode until the user manually sets the size of the tile; (col. 5 line 17-19, col. 5 lines 21-23) and

wherein when the user manually sets the size of the tile a manual mode is entered during which further automatic sizing of the tile is restricted (i.e. tile "is displayed within graphic boundaries ... which maintains a user-specified position relative to" additional tiles col. 8 lines 34-37, see also effect of cursor 56 on tile 11 in FIGS. 14- 15).

However, Hansen fails to teach wherein the automatic sizing routine is executed responsive to a change in tile content responsive to a change in tile content during an automatic mode, and sidebar having a defined size.

Leong teaches wherein the automatic sizing routine is executed responsive to a change in tile content. (see Leong, col. 3, lines 40-55) and sidebar having a defined size. (see Leong, fig. 8, col. 5, lines 50-65)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Leong's teaching with method of Hansen in order to provide user with the ability to adjust the window size based on the data.

As to claim 3, Hansen and Leong teach the system of claim 1. Hansen further teaches wherein once the manual mode is entered (i.e. by selecting adjustment of the tile rather than the sidebar, col. 5 line 17-19, col. 5 lines 21-23), the user may make a selection to return the tile to the automatic mode (i.e. by selecting adjustment of the sidebar rather than the tile, col. 8 lines 42-44, col. 8 line 50, col. 8 lines 60-62, col. 1 line 60-col. 2 line 14 and col. 4 lines 21-25).

As to claim 4, Hansen and Leong teach the system of claim 1. Hansen further teaches wherein a maximum size is set for the tile and in the manual mode (col. 5 lines 24-26, col. 5 lines 28-30) Leong teaches prevented from resizing the tile beyond the maximum size (see Leong, col. 5, lines 45-65),

As to claim 5, Hansen and Leong teach the system of claim 4. Hansen further teaches wherein the maximum size for the tile may be set by the tile (i.e. no means provided to size larger when extended to the point that no "shift buttons," described in col. 3 lines 50-52, appear, also compare tiles 11 12 and 32 and cursor 56 in FIGS. 13-15, note use and lack of "shift buttons").

As to claim 8, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Supra.

As to claim 9, Hansen and Leong teach the computer-readable medium of claim 8. Hansen further teaches wherein a maximum size is specified for the tile and limitations are placed on sizing the tile above the maximum size (fig. 43, items 43; maximize is the max size of the title which user cann't over wire. compare tiles 11 12 and 32 and cursor 56 in FIGS. 13-15, note use and lack of "shift buttons").

As to claim 12, Hansen and Leong teach the computer-readable medium of claim 8. Hansen further teaches the medium comprising a context menu (i.e. "customize menu" 72, 71) with options that are provided for the tile (87-89).

As to claim 14, Hansen and Leong teach the computer-readable medium of claim 12. Hansen further teaches wherein context menu (72) options include one or more of move up, move down (note instruction "Drag an Item to Move" within 71 for 72), or delete tile (i.e. delete from sidebar, 87).

As to claim 15, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Supra.

As to claim 16, Hansen and Leong teach the system of claim 15. Hansen (10, FIGS. 12-15) wherein the tile (i.e. 13 FIGS. 12-15) is arranged along with a plurality of additional tiles (e.g. 14, FIGS. 12-15) in side bar.

As to claim 19, Hansen and Leong teach the system of claim 15. Hansen further teaches the method comprising a context menu (i.e. "customize menu" 72, 71) that is provided with options for the tile (87-89).

As to claim 20, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Supra.

As to claim 21, Hansen and Leong teach the method of claim 20. Hansen further teaches wherein a sidebar area (10 FIGS. 12-15) is provided for the tile (e.g. 13 FIGS. 12-15) and a plurality of additional tiles (e.g. 14, FIGS. 12-15), and the available space in the sidebar is a factor in the automatic sizing of the tile (i.e. size of tile 15 reduced due to cursor 56 reducing sidebar width, compare FIGS. 12 and 13).

As to claim 22, Hansen and Leong teach the method of claim 21. Hansen further teaches wherein an additional factor in the automatic sizing of the tile is the amount of space that the tile requires for displaying its content (i.e. clock automatically displayed without date when cursor 56 adjusts tile 13 between FIG. 12 and FIG. 13, see also calendar example: col. 6 lines 35-39 shown in FIGS. 25 and 27).

As to claim 23, Hansen and Leong teach the method of claim 20. Hansen further teaches wherein a maximum size is set for the tile (col. 5 lines 24-26, col. 5 lines 28-30, compare tiles 11 12 and 32 and cursor 56 in FIGS. 13-15, note use and lack of "shift buttons").

Claims 27- 31, 33, 34, 38-39, 41, 42, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693) Leong US Patent US Patent 5,513,342 in view of Tilt US Patent US Patent 5,363,481.

As to claim 27, Hansen teaches in a computer system with a display (FIG. 2), a method for sizing a tile on the display (cursor 56 FIG. 14, col. 5 line 17-19), the method comprising:

providing the tile within a side bar on the display, side sidebar having a defined size on the display, said tile display first content (col. 1 lines 52-55), and

automatically resizing the tile within the side bar (col. 8 lines 42-44, col. 8 lines 49-50 and col. 8 lines 60-62) a plurality of times (i.e. tile "proportionately expands/shrinks" each time sidebar is adjusted col. 1 line 60-col. 2 line 15) with based at least in part on changes in the content that is to be displayed in the tile (compare size and content changes of tiles 10-15 between FIGS. 12 and 13).

Providing the resized tile on the display, said resized title display second content.(see Hansen, col. 5, lines 25-30)

However, Hansen fails to teach resizing the tile within the sidebar a plurality time without resizing the sidebar and sidebar having a defined size.

Leong teaches wherein the resizing the tile within the sidebar a plurality time without resizing the sidebar (see Leong, col. 3, lines 40-55) and sidebar having a defined size. (see Leong, fig. 8, col. 5, lines 50-65)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Leong's teaching with method of Hansen in order to provide user with the ability to adjust the window size based on the data.

However, Hansen and Leong fail to teach wherein the automatic resizing of the tile is permitted when a time differential between first resizing event and a second resizing event is greater than a predetermined time interval and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically resized otherwise.

Tilt 5363481 teaches wherein the automatic executing a command is permitted when a time differential between first executing event and a second executing event is greater than a predetermined time interval and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically resized otherwise. (see Tilt, col. I, lines 40-70)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Tilt 's teaching with method of Hansen in order to provide user with timer control.

As to claim 28, Hansen, Leong and Tilt teach the method of claim 27. Hansen further teaches wherein a sidebar area (10 FIGS. 12-15) is provided on the display in which the tile (e.g. 13 FIGS. 12-15) and a plurality of additional tiles (e.g. 14, FIGS. 12-15) are located.

As to claim 29, Hansen, Leong and Tilt teach the method of claim 27. Hansen further teaches wherein a user is able to manually resize a tile (cursor 56 FIG. 14, col. 5 line 17-19, col. 5 lines 21-23).

As to claim 30, Hansen, Leong and Tilt teach the method of claim 29. Hansen further teaches wherein when a user manually resizes a tile a manual mode is entered (col. 5 line 17-19,

col. 5 lines 21-23), and wherein during the manual mode the tile may not be automatically resized (i.e. maintains a user-specific position, col. 8 lines 34-37, see also effect of cursor 56 on tile 11 in FIGS. 14-15).

As to claim 31, Hansen, Leong and Tilt teach the method of claim 27. Hansen further teaches wherein a maximum size is specified for a tile (col. 5 lines 24-26, col. 5 lines 28-30, compare tiles 11 12 and 32 and cursor 56 in FIGS. 13-15, note use and lack of "shift buttons").

As to claim 33, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 27. Supra.

As to claim 34, Hansen, Leong and Tilt teach the computer-readable medium of claim 33. Hansen further teaches the medium comprising a context menu component for providing a context menu (i.e. "customize menu" 72, 71) with options for a tile (87-89).

As to claim 38, Hansen, Leong and Tilt teach the computer-readable medium of claim 33. Hansen further teaches wherein the automatic resizing of the tile is in some instances based at least in part on changes to content that is to be displayed in the tile (i.e. clock automatically displayed without date when cursor 56 adjusts tile 13 between FIG. 12 and FIG. 13, see also calendar example: col. 6 lines 35-39 shown in FIGS. 25 and 27).

As per claim 39, Hansen, Leong and Tilt teach the medium of claim 33. Hansen further teaches wherein the automatic resizing component is executed responsive to an application program being opened. (see Hansen, fig. 19-20, where the size of the tile is changed with the open of calendar)

As to claim 41, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 27. Supra.

As to claim 42, Hansen, Leong and Tilt teach the system of claim 41. Hansen further teaches the method comprising a manual resizing routine which allows a user to manually resize the tile (col. 5 line 17-19, col. 5 lines 21-23), wherein when a user manually resizes a tile a manual sizing mode is entered, wherein during the manual sizing mode the tile may not be automatically resized (i.e. maintains a user-specific position, col. 8 lines 34-37, see also effect of cursor 56 on tile 11 in FIGS. 14-15).

As to claim 46, Hansen and Tilt teaches the system of claim 41. wherein a tile may specify a maximum size for itself which may not be overridden by a user (i.e. no means provided to go beyond or override the maximum size, col. 5 lines 24-26, col. 5 lines 28- 30, compare tiles 11 12 and 32 and cursor 56 in FIGS. 13-15, note use and lack of "shift buttons").

Claims 6-7, 10-11, 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693) in view of Leong US Patent US Patent 5,513,342 in view of Nielsen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,437,758 B1).

As to claim 6, note the discussion of Hansen above. Hansen and Leong teach the system of claim 6. Hansen further wherein a maximum size is specified for a tile, but does not teach that in order to automatically size the tile beyond the maximum size, approval must be obtained from

the user. Nielsen teaches a window that contains a plurality of four titles and partial text of the titled articles (Fig. 10, col. 13 lines 55-57) and based on user input "the invention starts expanding the article text by a magnification factor to an optimal size for the user" (col. 13 lines 64-65). This expansion can be problematic in that "as the text expands within the limited bounds of the view the amount of text that can be displayed in the unmagnified view is reduced" (col. 14 lines 35-37 of Nielsen, also note that as the tile containing 1105 and 1107 in Fig. 11 expands the tile containing 1113 and 1115 become unreadable, and tiles 1109 and 1117 now have deleted content). To remedy this problem, "the maximum magnification of the text is limited" (col. 14 lines 37- 38 of Nielsen). Furthermore, in an effort to give the user more control, "the maximum size of an expanded article can be specified as a user preference" (col. 15 lines 30-31 of Nielsen). Nielsen further describes a "Dialog - A specialized window that is used to obtain additional information from the user ... to obtain options and parameters that are computer dependent ... If the user confirms the command, the user provided information acquired by the dialog is used in the execution of the command that evoked the dialog" (col. 7 lines 31-34, 41-44 of Nielsen).

It would therefore have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the dialog to control the maximum size of tiles (or ability to set tiles greater) taught by Nielsen with the maximum size of tiles taught by Hansen to avoid a situation where "too much magnification of the text within a limited space results in a column of words that is difficult to read" (col. 14 lines 41-42 of Nielsen).

As to claim 7, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 6 above. Hansen further teaches the system of claim 6, wherein the tile (i.e. tile 13, FIGS. 12-15) is

located in a sidebar (sidebar 10 FIGS. 12-15) and the maximum size for the tile may be set by the sidebar (i.e. no means provided to go beyond or override the maximum size, col. 5 lines 24-26, col. 5 lines 28-30, compare tiles 11 12 and 32 and cursor 56 in FIGS. 12-15, especially note effect of 56 in FIG. 12, also note use and lack of "shift buttons").

As to claim 10, note the discussion of Hansen and Leong regarding claim 9 above. This claim differs from claim 6 only in that claim 10 is directed to a computer readable medium, established in the analysis of claim 8.

As to claim 11, this claim differs from claim 10 only in that the approval is obtained from the user through a notification that is provided to the user. As discussed above, Nielsen teaches such a notification through a "dialog".

As to claim 24, note the discussion of Hansen regarding the method elements of claims 20 and 23 above. This claim differs from claim 6 only in that it is directed to a method claim.

As to claim 25, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 24 above. This claim differs from claim 11 only in that it is directed to a method claim.

As to claim 26, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 25 above. Nielsen teaches that the "expansion can be to a predetermined user preference" or that "expansion can be dynamically determined" (col. 14 lines 25-28 of Nielsen).

Furthermore, as discussed in Hansen above, the lack of "shift buttons" show that the tile has reached its maximum size (i.e. no means provided to go beyond or override the maximum size, col. 5 lines 24-26, col. 5 lines 28-30, compare tiles 11 12 and 32 and cursor 56 in FIGS. 13-15). Thus, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided for additional "dynamic" resizing without approval as taught by Nielsen beyond the restrictions beyond maximum size without approval as taught by Hansen because if user approves the new size as taught through the dialog box, additional resizing may be performed "dynamically" without further approval so that the tile can be optionally expanded. If user does not approve the new size, the maximum size would be restricted from further automatic resizing. Thus the tile would be able to be adjusted accordingly "by a magnification factor to an optimal size for the user" (col. 13 line 65 of Nielsen).

Claims 32, 37 and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693) Leong US Patent US Patent 5,513,342 in view of Tilt US Patent US Patent 5,363,481 in view of Nielsen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,437,758 B1).

As to claim 32, note the discussion of Hansen above. Hansen and Tilt teach the system of claim 6. Hansen further wherein a maximum size is specified for a tile, but does not teach that in order to automatically size the tile beyond the maximum size, approval must be obtained from the user. Nielsen teaches a window that contains a plurality of four titles and partial text of the

titled articles (Fig. 10, col. 13 lines 55-57) and based on user input "the invention starts expanding the article text by a magnification factor to an optimal size for the user" (col. 13 lines 64-65). This expansion can be problematic in that "as the text expands within the limited bounds of the view the amount of text that can be displayed in the unmagnified view is reduced" (col. 14 lines 35-37 of Nielsen, also note that as the tile containing 1105 and 1107 in Fig. 11 expands the tile containing 1113 and 1115 become unreadable, and tiles 1109 and 1117 now have deleted content). To remedy this problem, "the maximum magnification of the text is limited" (col. 14 lines 37- 38 of Nielsen). Furthermore, in an effort to give the user more control, "the maximum size of an expanded article can be specified as a user preference" (col. 15 lines 30-31 of Nielsen). Nielsen further describes a "Dialog - A specialized window that is used to obtain additional information from the user ... to obtain options and parameters that are computer dependent ... If the user confirms the command, the user provided information acquired by the dialog is used in the execution of the command that evoked the dialog" (col. 7 lines 31-34, 41-44 of Nielsen).

It would therefore have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the dialog to control the maximum size of tiles (or ability to set tiles greater) taught by Nielsen with the maximum size of tiles taught by Hansen to avoid a situation where "too much magnification of the text within a limited space results in a column of words that is difficult to read" (col. 14 lines 41-42 of Nielsen)

As to claim 37, note the discussion of Hansen regarding claim 33 above. This claim is substantially identical to claim 32 analyzed above.

As to claim 43, note the discussion of Hansen regarding claim 41 above. Hansen further teaches the system of claim 6, wherein the tile (i.e. tile 13, FIGS. 12-15) is located in a sidebar (sidebar 10 FIGS. 12-15) and the maximum size for the tile may be set by the sidebar (i.e. no means provided to go beyond or override the maximum size, col. 5 lines 24-26, col. 5 lines 28-30, compare tiles 11 12 and 32 and cursor 56 in FIGS. 12-15, especially note effect of 56 in FIG. 12, also note use and lack of "shift buttons").

As to claim 44, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 43. Nielsen teaches that the "expansion can be to a predetermined user preference" or that "expansion can be dynamically determined" (col. 14 lines 25-28 of Nielsen).

As to claim 45, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 44. Nielsen teaches that the "expansion can be to a predetermined user preference" or that "expansion can be dynamically determined" (col. 14 lines 25-28 of Nielsen).

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693) Leong US Patent US Patent 5,513,342, in view of Tilt US Patent US Patent 5,363,481 further in view of Southgate (U.S. Patent No. 5,880,725).

As to claim 40, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 39. Both Hansen and Nielsen do not teach a minimum time interval used to prevent the tile from being automatically resized smaller, nor do they teach that the tile is allowed to be automatically

resized larger, regardless of whether the minimum time interval has been reached. Southgate teaches a tiled window display where "the minimum size can be limited because of the type of information that the window displays" and "the maximum dimensions, likewise determine the maximum dimensions allowed for the height and width of each window" (col. 7 lines 54-55, 58-60 of Southgate). Regarding the minimum area, Southgate teaches that "if the selected window cannot be shrunk to fit in the allocated tiled area because of the minimum height ... 'the user is informed that the selected window cannot be fitted into the tiled area'" (col. 10 lines 8-12 of Southgate). It would therefore have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the smaller and larger resizing limitations taught in Southgate with the time interval limitations taught by Nielsen onto the computer-readable medium taught by Hansen so that the "selected window can be made to fit inside the tiled area by shrinking it (but not below its minimum height)" within the time interval (col. 9 lines 1-2).

Claims 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693) in view of Leong US Patent US Patent 5,513,342 further in view of Carpenter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,997).

As to claim 13, note the discussion of Hansen and Leong above. Hansen teaches a context menu, but does not teach at least one of the context menu options for auto-sizing the tile. Carpenter teaches a context menu option for automatically loading previously-sized layouts, saved by the user (230 FIG. 56, col. 12 lines 46-47). It would therefore have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the autosizing layout of

Carpenter into the context menu of Hansen to allow "selecting a different software button size in a configuration menu" so that "the size of each software button in the plurality of software buttons is changed" (col. 12 line 66- col. 13 line 2 of Carpenter).

Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693) Leong US Patent US Patent 5,513,342, in view of Tilt US Patent US Patent 5,363,481 further in view of Carpenter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,997).

As to claim 35, Hansen, Leong, and Tilt teach claim 34. Hansen teaches a context menu, but does not teach at least one of the context menu options for auto-sizing the tile. Carpenter teaches a context menu option for automatically loading previously-sized layouts, saved by the user (230 FIG. 56, col. 12 lines 46-47). It would therefore have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the autosizing layout of Carpenter into the context menu of Hansen to allow "selecting a different software button size in a configuration menu" so that "the size of each software button in the plurality of software buttons is changed" (col. 12 line 66- col. 13 line 2 of Carpenter).

As to claim 36, Hansen, Leong, Tilt, and Carpenter teach the computer-readable medium of claim 35. Hansen further teaches wherein additional context menu options include options for one or more of moving the tile up or down (note instruction "Drag an Item to Move" within 71 for 72) or deleting the tile (i.e. delete from sidebar, 87).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/02/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments focused on the following:

- A) Whether Hansen and Leong teach the tile within the sidebar having the defined size?
- A) Leong teaches this limitation because the tiles are reset based the defined size of the side bar. (see Leong, col. 5, lines 45-65)
- B) Whether Hansen and Leong teach "when the tile is in the manual mode, the tile is restricted from being automatically resize?"

B) In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "when the tile is in the manual mode, the tile is restricted from being automatically resize") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SIMON KE whose telephone number is (571)272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke
/Peng Ke/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174